

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DAVID PALLIES,

Plaintiff,

V.

THE BOEING COMPANY, a Delaware
corporation

Defendant.

Case No. C16-1437RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. Dkt. # 52.

The motion underlying the Court’s order was plaintiff’s motion to compel, Dkt. # 20, which primarily sought discovery of certain privileged conversations, but also raised a dispute with defendant over the availability of depositions, Dkt. # 20 at 10; Dkt. # 34 at 6. On September 6, 2017, the Court denied plaintiff’s motion, concluding the attorney-client privilege covered the conversations at issue. Dkt. # 49. Plaintiff does not move for reconsideration of that ruling, but instead reasserts his argument regarding the disputed depositions noted above.¹

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will be granted only upon a “showing of manifest error in the prior ruling” or “new facts or legal authority which could not have been

¹ Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration raises a second issue from his original motion, but a recent filing by plaintiff indicates that issue has since been resolved. See Dkt. # 54.

1 brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has
2 failed to meet that standard, but because he preserved the aforementioned argument before the
3 discovery cutoff, the Court will allow him to reassert it in a subsequent motion.

4 The Court will DENY plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, but grant plaintiff leave to
5 file one additional motion limited to the deposition dispute referenced in his motion for
6 reconsideration. Plaintiff is directed to file that motion on or before Thursday, October 5, 2017.

7

8 DATED this 2nd day of October, 2017.

9

10

Robert S. Lasnik

11 Robert S. Lasnik

12 United States District Judge

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28